

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appellant: Bazot et al.

Conf. No.: 8489

Serial No.: 10/677,467

Art Unit: 2444

Filed: 10/02/2003

Examiner: Christensen, Scott B.

Title: METHOD OF ACCESSING
INTERNET RESOURCES
THROUGH A PROXY WITH
IMPROVED SECURITY

Docket No.: FR920020066US1
(IBMC-0079)

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

BRIEF OF APPELLANT

This is an appeal from the Final Office Action dated March 18, 2010, rejecting claims 1 and 4. This Brief is accompanied by the requisite fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. 41.20 (b)(2).

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

International Business Machines Corporation is the real party in interest.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

As filed, this case included claims 1-5. Claims 1 and 4 were previously amended. Claims 2, 3, and 5 were previously canceled. Claims 1 and 4 remain pending. Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected and form the basis of this appeal.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

A Final Office Action was issued by the Office dated March 18, 2010 in response to an Amendment that was filed on November 23, 2009 by Appellant. A response to the Final Office Action has not been filed.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The present invention provides a method of accessing internet resources through a proxy with improved security.

Claim 1 claims a method [p.5 l.15-17] of accessing Internet resources provided by at least a content server in a data transmission system including a proxy connected to an Internet network [p.4 l.12-18], said proxy being provided with authentication means for authenticating a user when receiving a request for Internet resources therefrom [p.4 l.18-22], and wherein said proxy transmits the user request to said content server [p.6 l.5-8] which sends back a response to the proxy together with at least one cookie containing information about said user

[p.6 l.8-9 and l.15-24]; said proxy receiving said response over the Internet network and detecting at least one cookie in the response [p.6 l.13-15] and storing the at least one cookie and an Internet address of the content server associated with the at least one cookie in a user context database [p.6 l.15-17] and transmitting said response to said user over the Internet network after said cookie has been removed from said response [p.6 l.24-25], so that said user can send all subsequent requests for accessing said Internet resources contained in said content server to said proxy over the Internet network [p.6 l.28-29], wherein said cookie which has been stored in said user context database is added to all subsequent requests from said user for accessing Internet resources in said content server [p.5 l.28 – p.6 l.4], wherein said proxy is configured to establish a connection to said content server on behalf of said user when receiving said request from said user [p.4 l.25-30], and wherein said cookie is transmitted by said configured proxy to said content server when said user sends subsequent requests for the URL of the said content server [p.6 l.30-31], even if said content server does not belong in the said proxy server's domain [p.5 l.11-14].

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

1. Whether claims 1 and 4 are unpatentable under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Brown et al (US 6970918).

ARGUMENT

1. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 and 4 UNDER 35 USC 102(e)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection over Brown, Appellant

asserts that Brown does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. Specifically regarding the Office's rejections of independent claim 1, Appellant submits that Brown fails to teach each and every feature of this claim.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*: "said proxy receiving said response over the Internet network and detecting at least one cookie in the response and storing the at least one cookie and an Internet address of the content server associated with the at least one cookie in a user context database and transmitting said response to said user over the Internet network after said cookie has been removed from said response." Brown does not teach this feature of Appellant's invention.

The Office cites, *inter alia*, Brown at col.6 lines 27-42 and col. 4 lines 62-65 as teaching "storing the at least one cookie and an Internet address of the content server in a user context database." Final Office Action p.3. Appellant asserts Brown does not teach this feature and does not teach this feature as claimed.

In order to anticipate the claimed invention, the reference must "disclose[] within the four corners of the document not only all of the limitations claimed but also all of the limitations arranged or combined in the same way as recited in the claim." *Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.*, No. 2007-1565, slip op. at 17-18 (Fed. Cir. 2008). Brown does not disclose all of the limitations claimed and, as such, Appellants respectfully assert that the Office's rejection of claim 1 as anticipated by Brown is deficient.

Brown discusses, "the process used in the preferred embodiment of the

invention is depicted in FIG. 4.” Col. 4 lines 47-48. Reviewing the process disclosed by Brown in FIG. 4 and Col. 4 line 47 – Col. 6 line 42, Brown does not teach or suggest in reference to a response “detecting at least one cookie in the response and storing the at least one cookie and an Internet address of the content server associated with the at least one cookie in a user context database.”

Claim 1, recites, *inter alia*, “wherein said proxy is configured to establish a connection to said content server on behalf of said user when receiving said request from said user, and wherein said cookie is transmitted by said configured proxy to said content server when said user sends subsequent requests for the URL of the said content server, even if said content server does not belong in the said proxy server’s domain.” Brown does not teach this feature of Appellant’s invention.

The Office cites Brown at “Figure 2a” as teaching this feature. Final Office Action p.4. A review of Figure 2a and the associated paragraph of Brown describing Figure 2a (Col. 3 line 49 – Col. 4 line 2) does not reveal a teaching of this feature. As stated by Brown “With reference now to FIG. 2a, there is depicted a block diagram of a preferred Internet connection between client device 10 and content provider 18 via content server 16.” The cited portions of the reference and Brown generally fail to teach this feature of Appellant’s claim.

As a result, Appellants respectfully request reversal of the rejection of claim 1 and claim 4, which depends therefrom, as allegedly being anticipated by Brown.

Appellant submits that for the reasons stated above, the cited reference Brown fails to establish a prima facie showing of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that the Office's rejection be reversed.

CONCLUSION

In summary, Appellant submits that claims 1 and 4 are allowable because the claimed invention is not unpatentable over Brown.

Respectfully submitted,

/David E. Rook/

Date: April 27, 2010

David E. Rook
Reg. No.: 40,790

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. Method of accessing Internet resources provided by at least a content server in a data transmission system including a proxy connected to an Internet network, said proxy being provided with authentication means for authenticating a user when receiving a request for Internet resources therefrom, and wherein said proxy transmits the user request to said content server which sends back a response to the proxy together with at least one cookie containing information about said user;

said proxy receiving said response over the Internet network and detecting at least one cookie in the response and storing the at least one cookie and an Internet address of the content server associated with the at least one cookie in a user context database and transmitting said response to said user over the Internet network after said cookie has been removed from said response, so that said user can send all subsequent requests for accessing said Internet resources contained in said content server to said proxy over the Internet network, wherein said cookie which has been stored in said user context database is added to all subsequent requests from said user for accessing Internet resources in said content server, wherein said proxy is configured to establish a connection to said content server on behalf of said user when receiving said request from said user, and wherein said cookie is transmitted by said configured proxy to said content server when said user sends subsequent requests for the URL of the said content server, even if said content server does not belong in the said proxy server's domain.

4. Method according to claim 1, wherein the response from said content server to said proxy includes a statement "set-cookies," said statement being removed from said response before transmitting said response to said user.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence has been submitted.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no related proceedings.